

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/710,423	07/09/2004	Richard Heller	1372.32.UTLCPDV2	5054
21901 SMITH HOPE	901 7590 04/12/2010 MITH HOPEN, PA		EXAMINER	
180 PINE AVENUE NORTH			WITCZAK, CATHERINE	
OLDSMAR, FL 34677			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3767	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/12/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATENTS@SMITHHOPEN.COM ajhopen@yahoo.com PAIR@SMITHHOPEN.COM

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/710,423	HELLER ET AL.
Examiner-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	CATHERINE N. WITCZAK	3767
All Participants:	Status of Application: RC	<u>E</u>
(1) <u>CATHERINE N. WITCZAK</u> .	(3)	
(2) Molly Sauter.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 7 April 2010	Time: <u>3:30</u>	
Type of Interview:	int's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:  1  Prior art documents discussed: US 5,309,910 US5,546,940 US5,598 848  Part II.  SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENEI Amendments to the claims were discussed to overcome the new upon, and as such the claims overcome the prior art and are in oc Examiner's Amendment. Furthermore, based on Applicant's argu- rejection over US 6,778,893 (as well as the change of scope of it amendment to the claims), the double patenting rejection over US 6 ilmitations to the claims, the double patenting rejection over US 6  Part III.	ly found references listed above. In andition for allowance. These ame iments in the response filed 3/9/10 he claims resulting from the incorp S 6,778,853 has been withdrawn. The claims resulting from the add.	Limitations were agreed andments will be entered as an 0 regarding the double patenting oration of the agreed upon As for the double patenting ition of the agreed upon
☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate r	ecord of the substance of the	interview since the interview
It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summar	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/Catherine N Witezak/ Examiner, Art Unit 3767	.pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)